



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/527,615

03/11/2005

Amjad Ali

21149YP

7226

210

7590

12/22/2010

MERCK

P O BOX 2000

RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/22/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/527,615	Applicant(s) ALI ET AL.	
	Examiner Sabiha Qazi	Art Unit 1628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,11-14,20-24,29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,11-14,20,21,23,29 and 30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/11/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Application/Control Number:
10/527,615
Art Unit: 1628

Page 2

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1, 4, 11-14, 20-24, 29 and 30 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Amendments are entered.

Summary of this Office Action

1. Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114
2. Information Disclosure Statement
3. Copending Applications
4. Specification
5. 35 USC § 112 (1) Rejection
6. Communication

Application/Control Number:
10/527,615
Art Unit: 1628

Page 3

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/16/10 have been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Scope of Enablement Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of certain glucocorticoid receptor-mediated diseases (or conditions) does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of all glucocorticoid receptor -mediated diseases (or conditions), The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

To be enabling, the specification of the patent must teach those skilled in the

art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Explaining what is meant by “undue experimentation,” the Federal Circuit has stated:

The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed to enable the determination of how to practice a desired embodiment of the claimed invention. PPG v. Guardian, 75 F.3d 1558, 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1996).¹

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, 153 (CCPA 1977), have been clarified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986), and are summarized in In re Wands (858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed Cir. 1988)). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

¹ As pointed out by the court in In re Angstadt, 537 F.2d 498 at 504 (CCPA 1976), the key word is “undue”, not “experimentation”.

When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

The nature of the invention:

Claims are

The predictability or unpredictability of the art: There is lack of predictability in the in the pharmaceutical art. Specification discloses (lines 1-11 on page 27) that “the term "treating" encompasses not only treating a patient to relieve the patient of the signs and symptoms of the disease or condition but also prophylactically treating an asymptomatic patient to prevent the onset of the disease or condition or preventing, slowing or reversing the progression of the disease or condition. The term "amount effective for treating" is intended to mean that amount of a drug or pharmaceutical agent that will elicit the biological or medical response of a tissue, a system, animal or human that is being sought by a researcher, veterinarian, medical doctor or other clinician: The term also encompasses the amount of a pharmaceutical drug that will prevent or reduce the risk of occurrence of the biological or medical event that is sought to be prevented in a tissue, a system, animal or human by a researcher, veterinarian, medical doctor or other clinician”.

The specification discloses that “another embodiment of the invention encompasses a method for treating a glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or condition in a mammalian patient in need of such treatment comprising administering the patient a compound of Formula I in an amount that is effective for treating the glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or condition.

Within this embodiment is encompassed the above method wherein the glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or condition is selected from the group consisting of: tissue rejection, leukemias, lymphomas, Cushing's syndrome, acute adrenal insufficiency, congenital adrenal hyperplasia, rheumatic fever, polyarteritis nodosa, granulomatous polyarteritis, inhibition of myeloid cell lines, immune proliferation/apoptosis, HPA axis suppression and regulation, hypercortisolemia, stroke and spinal cord injury, hypercalcemia, hyperglycemias, acute adrenal insufficiency, chronic primary adrenal insufficiency, secondary adrenal insufficiency, congenital adrenal hyperplasia, cerebral edema, thrombocytopenia, Little's syndrome, obesity, metabolic syndrome, inflammatory bowel disease, systemic lupus erythematosus, polyartitis nodosa, Wegener's granulomatosis, giant cell arteritis, rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile rheumatoid arthritis, uveitis, hay fever,

allergic rhinitis, urticaria, angioneurotic edema, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, tendonitis, bursitis, Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, autoimmune chronic active hepatitis, organ transplantation, hepatitis, cirrhosis, inflammatory scalp alopecia, panniculitis, psoriasis, discoid lupus erythematosus, inflamed cysts, atopic dermatitis, pyoderma gangrenosum, pemphigus vulgaris, bullous pemphigoid, systemic lupus erythematosus, dermatomyositis, herpes gestationis, eosinophilic fasciitis, relapsing polychondritis, inflammatory vasculitis, sarcoidosis, Sweet's disease, type I reactive leprosy, capillary hemangiomas, contact dermatitis, atopic dermatitis, lichen planus, exfoliative dermatitis, erythema nodosum, acne, hirsutism, toxic epidermal necrolysis, erythema multiform, cutaneous T-cell lymphoma, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), cell apoptosis, cancer, Kaposi's sarcoma, retinitis pigmentosa, cognitive performance, memory and learning enhancement, depression, addiction, mood disorders, chronic fatigue syndrome, schizophrenia, sleep disorders, and anxiety. Another embodiment of the invention encompasses a method of selectively modulating the activation, repression, agonism and antagonism effects of the glucocorticoid receptor in a mammal comprising administering to the mammal a compound of Formula I in an amount that is

effective to modulate the glucocorticoid receptor". See lines 17-28 on page 23 and 1-24 on page 24.

The specification discloses biological assays to evaluate the activity of the compounds as modulators of the glucocorticoid receptor can be evaluated using ligand binding assays (page 118). Since the instant specification no guidance for the treatment of all the diseases as further provides no limiting definition of the term "prevention", the term will be interpreted expansively. The term "prevention" may vary widely in meaning, from "preventing" a disease from occurring to "preventing" it from progressing. Nor is the term limited by any time frame.

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling. >See, e.g., Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc., 363 F.3d 1247, 1254, 70 USPQ2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("Nascent

technology, however, must be enabled with a 'specific and useful teaching.' The law requires an enabling disclosure for nascent technology because a person of ordinary skill in the art has little or no knowledge independent from the patentee's instruction. Thus, the public's end of the bargain struck by the patent system is a full enabling disclosure of the claimed technology."

The "predictability or lack thereof" in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. If one skilled in the art can readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which the claimed invention pertains, then there is predictability in the art. On the other hand, if one skilled in the art cannot readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which that claimed invention pertains, then there is lack of predictability in the art. Accordingly, what is known in the art provides evidence as to the question of predictability. In particular, the court in *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223-24, 169 USPQ 367, 369-70 (CCPA 1971), stated:

The breadth of the claims: The claims are broad; they are drawn to various methods for treating or preventing a wide variety of diseases or conditions.

Claim 24 is drawn to a method for treating a glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or condition in a mammalian patient in need of such treatment comprising administering the patient a compound according to Claim 1 in an amount that is effective for treating the glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or condition.

Glucocorticoid receptor mediated disease or conditions

The amount of direction or guidance presented: There is no guidance in the disclosure on how to use the invention successfully for the treatment or

prevention of such a wide variety of diseases or conditions. Since the instant specification provides no limiting definition of the term “prevention”, the term will be interpreted expansively. The term “prevention” may vary widely in meaning, from “preventing” a disease from occurring to “preventing” it from progressing. Nor is the term limited by any time frame.

The claims are thus very broad insofar as they suggest that one will not experience the disease when taking the claimed agent; that should one get the disease, it will not worsen; or that following its treatment, it will not recur. While such “prevention” might theoretically be possible under strictly controlled laboratory conditions, as a practical matter it is nearly impossible to achieve in the “real world” in which patients live.

The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring “ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art” (Fields v. Conover, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)). Additionally, the courts have determined that “... where a statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles”, a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper (In re Marzocchi, 169 USPQ 367 (CCPA 1971)).

The presence or absence of working examples: The disclosure does not contain any working examples. There are some assays and some techniques in the specification, but they are not useful in the treatment or prevention of the wide variety of said diseases or conditions as claimed.

A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See *In re Riat et al.* (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; *In re Barr et al.* (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

The quantity of experimentation necessary: Since there are no working examples, no data, and no guidance presented in the disclosure, one skilled in the art at the time of invention would have to go through undue experimentation to make and use the presently claimed invention.. Accordingly, the instant claims do not comply with the enablement requirement of §112, since to practice the claimed invention in its “full scope” a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation, with no reasonable expectation of success.

Response to Remark

Applicant's response filed on 2/16/10 is hereby acknowledged. Applicants arguments were found persuasive and claims are amended therefore rejection is withdrawn. However, compound 104 of claim 22 where there an additional substitution other than CF₃ is present. This substitution is not in claim 1. Even though claim 22 is not dependent of claim 1, Applicant is requested to show the support of this compound while responding to this office action.

In order to advance the prosecution Applicant may consider calling the Examiner to discuss the issues.

Communication

Application/Control Number:
10/527,615
Art Unit: 1628

Page 13

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fetterolf Brandon can be reached on (571) 272-2919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/527,615
Art Unit: 1628

Page 14

/Sabiha Qazi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1628